IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

FREDRICK GOINGS,)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) Case No. 16-CV-489-SMY-RJD
)
JOHN BALDWIN, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YANDLE, District Judge:

This matter is before the Court for consideration of Plaintiff Fredrick Goings' Motion for Relief Pursuant to Rule 59(e) (Doc. 353). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) provides a basis for relief when a party challenges the Court's application of the law to the facts of the case. *See Osterneck v. Ernst & Whinney*, 489 U.S. 169, 174-76 (1989). A Rule 59(e) motion will be granted upon a showing of either evidence in the record that clearly establishes a manifest error of law or fact or newly discovered evidence not previously available. *Sigsworth v. City of Aurora, Ill.*, 487 F.3d 506, 511-12 (7th Cir. 2007); *Romo v. Gulf Stream Coach, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 1119, 1121 n.3 (7th Cir. 2001). "Manifest error" is not demonstrated merely by the disappointment of the losing party. *Sedrak v. Callahan*, 987 F.Supp. 1063, 1069 (N.D. Ill. 1997). Rather, it is a court's "wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent." *Id.*

Goings' Motion states only that he opposes this Court's decision and believes that it was "erroneous." He sets forth no grounds for reconsideration, does not make any argument or showing of manifest error of law or fact, and does not identify any newly discovery evidence.

Simply put, Goings offers no reason why this Court should reconsider its August 16, 2019 Order.

Accordingly, the Motion is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 26, 2019

STACI M. YANDLE

United States District Judge